

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| IN RE INTEL CORPORATION |) | |
| MICROPROCESSOR ANTITRUST |) | MDL Docket No. 05-MD-1717-JJF |
| LITIGATION |) | Civil Action No. 1:05-CV-00485-JJF |

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR
CONSOLIDATION AND FOR APPOINTMENT OF
CO-LEAD COUNSEL AND LIAISON COUNSEL**

Michael D. Hausfeld
Daniel A. Small
Brent W. Landau
Allyson B. Baker
COHEN, MILSTEIN, HAUSFELD &
TOLL, P.L.L.C.
1100 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 500, West Tower
Washington, DC 20005
Proposed Co-Lead Counsel

James L. Holzman (DE Bar # 663)
David W. Gregory (DE Bar #4408)
Eric M. Andersen (DE Bar #4376)
Prickett, Jones & Elliott, P.A.
1310 King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 888-6500
jllholzman@prickett.com
dwgregory@prickett.com
Proposed Liaison Counsel

Michael P. Lehmann
Thomas P. Dove
Alex C. Turan
THE FURTH FIRM, LLP
225 Bush Street, 15th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Proposed Co-Lead Counsel

Steven W. Berman
Anthony Shapiro
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO,
LLP
1301 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2900
Seattle, WA 98101
Proposed Co-Lead Counsel

Guido Saveri
R. Alexander Saveri
SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.
111 Pine Street, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94111
Proposed Co-Lead Counsel

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | ii |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| BACKGROUND | 2 |
| ARGUMENT | 3 |
| I. FEDERAL RULE 23(G) PROVIDES FOR THE DESIGNATION OF LEAD COUNSEL WHO HAVE EXEMPLARY QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE, AS WELL AS SUBSTANTIAL LITIGATION RESOURCES .. | 3 |
| II. PROPOSED LEAD COUNSEL HAVE ENORMOUS EXPERIENCE LITIGATING ANTITRUST CASES AND COMPLEX CIVIL ACTIONS | 5 |
| A. Cohen, Milstein, Hausfeld, & Toll..... | 5 |
| B. The Furth Firm | 7 |
| C. Hagens Berman Sobol & Shapiro | 9 |
| D. Saveri & Saveri | 11 |
| E. Prickett, Jones & Elliott (Proposed Liaison Counsel) | 13 |
| III. ENTERING THE PROPOSED ORDER WILL BEST REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF THE PROPOSED CLASS AND ALSO EXPEDITE THE LITIGATION..... | 14 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 15 |

Table of Authorities

Cases

| | |
|--|-------|
| <i>Coopersmith v. Lehman Bros., Inc.</i> , 344 F. Supp. 2d 783 (D. Mass. 2004) | 4 |
| <i>In re Auction Houses Antitrust Litig.</i> , 197 F.R.D. 71 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) | 14 |
| <i>In re Cardinal Health, Inc. ERISA Litig.</i> , 225 F.R.D. 552 (S.D. Ohio 2005) | 3, 14 |
| <i>In re Cement & Concrete Antitrust Litig.</i> , MDL No. 296, 1980 WL 1994, at *30 (D. Ariz. 1980) | 7 |
| <i>In re Cree, Inc. Securities Litig.</i> , 219 F.R.D. 369 (M.D.N.C. 2003) | 3 |
| <i>In re Delphi Erisa Litig.</i> , 230 F.R.D. 496 (E.D. Mich. 2005) | 3 |
| <i>In re Joint Eastern and Southern Districts Asbestos Litig.</i> , 132 F.R.D. 332 (E.D.N.Y.; S.D.N.Y., 1990) | 14 |
| <i>In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.</i> , 292 F.Supp.2d 644 (E.D. Pa. 2003) | 3, 14 |
| <i>In re Rubber Chemicals Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2005 WL 2649292 at * 8 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2005) | 4 |
| <i>Warner Communications, Inc. v. Murdock</i> , 581 F.Supp. 1482 (D. Del. 1984) | 4 |

Other Authorities

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| 28 U.S.C. § 1407 | 3 |
|------------------------|---|

Rules

| | |
|--------------------------|------|
| Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 | 1, 3 |
|--------------------------|------|

INTRODUCTION

Certain Plaintiffs¹ who filed antitrust purchaser actions against Intel Corporation (“Intel”) in this Court or whose cases have been transferred to this Court pursuant to JPML Transfer Order for Docket No. 1717, dated Nov. 8, 2005, Ex. A., (collectively “Centralized Actions”), respectfully request that the Court enter the attached proposed order. The proposed order would to consolidate all purchaser antitrust actions against Intel that have been filed with this court transferred to this Court for pretrial proceedings, consistent with the JPML Transfer Order. The proposed order also establishes a co-lead counsel structure for plaintiffs in the Centralized Actions. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 (g)(2)(A) (“[t]he court may designate counsel to act on behalf of the putative class before determining whether to certify the action as a class action.”). Specifically, the proposed order would appoint Cohen, Milstein, Hausfeld & Toll, P.L.L.C.; The Furth Firm LLP; Hagens Berman Sobol & Shaprio LLP; and Saveri & Saveri, Inc. as co-lead plaintiffs’ counsel and Prickett, Jones, & Elliott, in Wilmington, Delaware, as liaison counsel for the Centralized Actions.

The law firms proposed to serve as lead counsel and liaison counsel are well-suited to manage the litigation of the Centralized Actions. They bring exemplary qualifications, experience and resources to bear and have the support of a substantial number of firms whose clients have filed Intel class actions. The proposed lead attorneys have decades of class action and antitrust experience and have served as lead counsel in the largest recovery in U.S. litigation history and the largest antitrust recovery. Intel does not oppose this motion.

¹ Certain Plaintiffs who originally filed cases in this Court, as well cases in the Northern District of California, and other district courts. *See* list of certain Plaintiffs’ cases attached as Exhibit B.

BACKGROUND

As a result of its unlawful monopoly power, Intel has charged supra-competitive prices to computer manufacturers which then pass on the overcharges to consumers. *See* Complaint at ¶ 42, *Phil Paul v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00485-JJF (D. Del. July 12, 2005). Intel maintains this pricing scheme by engaging in multi-faceted efforts designed to stymie any inroads that competitors like Advanced Micro Devices (“AMD”) would otherwise make in the market for x86 microprocessors. *See* Complaint at ¶¶ 35-38, *Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. v. Intel Corp.*, No. 1:05-cv-00441-JJF (D. Del. June 27, 2005).

On June 27, 2005, AMD filed suit against Intel in this Court, where both companies have litigated many of their disputes. *See id.* Since then, more than sixty class actions have been brought in federal court by purchasers who have suffered antitrust injury as a result of Intel’s anticompetitive conduct. *See* List of actions pending against Intel, Ex. C. Almost all federal purchaser plaintiffs in actions against Intel nationwide support the proposed lead counsel structure. *See* Exs. B and C. In light of these facts and the following arguments, movants respectfully ask the Court to enter the attached proposed order.

ARGUMENT

I. **FEDERAL RULE 23(G) PROVIDES FOR THE DESIGNATION OF LEAD COUNSEL WHO HAVE EXEMPLARY QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE, AS WELL AS SUBSTANTIAL LITIGATION RESOURCES**

Courts look to the strictures of Rule 23(g) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure when designating lead counsel for a proposed class of plaintiffs. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g) advisory committee notes 2003 (“Rule 23(g)(2)(A) authorizes the court to designate interim counsel to act on behalf of the putative class before the certification decision is made.”). *See also In re Cardinal Health, Inc. ERISA Litig.*, 225 F.R.D. 552, 554-55 (S.D. Ohio 2005); *In re Delphi Erisa Litig.*, 230 F.R.D. 496, 498 (E.D. Mich. 2005).²

To this end, the Federal Rules enumerate the following factors that inform designation of lead counsel: (i) “the work counsel has done in identifying or investigating potential claims in the action; (ii) counsel’s experience in handling class actions, other complex litigation, and claims of the type asserted in the action; and (iii) counsel’s knowledge of the applicable law; and (vv) the resources counsel will commit to representing the class.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(1)(C)(i). *See also In re Cree, Inc. Securities Litig.*, 219 F.R.D. 369, 373 (M.D.N.C. 2003) (Designating a firm as lead

²Other District Courts in this Circuit have recognized that a district court has substantial discretion to appoint co-lead counsel in order to effectively manage complex, multidistrict litigation: “The multiplicity of suits requires that the district court be allowed to combine procedures, appoint lead counsel, recognize steering committees of lawyers, limit and manage discovery, etc. to minimize expense to all litigants and to provide judicial efficiency.” *In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.*, 292 F.Supp.2d 644, 653 (E.D. Pa. 2003) (quoting *In re Showa Denko K.K. L- Tryptophan Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 953 F.2d 162, 165 (4th Cir.1992) (citing *Manual for Complex Litigation (Second)* §§ 33.22, 33.25 (1985) (suggesting mechanism to organize counsel and discovery in mass tort litigation)). The district court’s ultimate goal in multidistrict litigation is to ‘... promote the just and efficient conduct of such actions.’” 28 U.S.C. § 1407(a).

counsel after finding that the firm had “extensive experience” with the particular area of litigation, class actions and also after finding that “the firm ha[d] sufficient resources to prosecute this action in a thorough and expeditious manner.”); *Coopersmith v. Lehman Bros., Inc.*, 344 F. Supp. 2d 783, 793 (D. Mass. 2004) (Designating two law firms as co-lead counsel because “[i]t is clear that these firms have extensive experience in cases such as this and are well situated to pursue this action on behalf of the class.”); *In re Rubber Chemicals Antitrust Litig.*, No. C. 04-1648 MJJ, 2005 WL 2649292, at * 8 (N.D. Cal. Oct 6, 2005) (appointing Cohen Milstein as co-lead counsel because it is “undisputed that th[is] counsel . . . ha[s] extensive experience and expertise in antitrust and other class actions, as well as other complex litigation, and have successfully prosecuted such cases in courts across the country.”).³

As discussed below in more detail, all of the proposed lead counsel have a great deal of experience with complex antitrust litigation.⁴ These attorneys and law firms also have impressive qualifications, a long record of success in complex litigation, a demonstrated willingness to invest substantial resources in the prosecution of complicated cases, and a long history of working together in such endeavors. Together, these firms have a combined total of more than 130 years of experience litigating antitrust actions, as well as other complex, civil cases. *See* Biographies of Firms and Individual Attorneys, collected and attached as Exhibits D-H.

³ Attached hereto as Exhibit I.

⁴ These firms and their attorneys also have handled cases in this District Court, Cohen Milstein litigated *Trotter v. Perdue Farms, Inc.*, No.99-393-RRM in front of the Honorable Joseph J. Farnan, Jr., and the Furth Firm litigated *Warner Communications, Inc. v. Murdock*, 581 F.Supp. 1482 (D. Del. 1984) in front of the Honorable Caleb M. Wright.

II. PROPOSED LEAD COUNSEL HAVE ENORMOUS EXPERIENCE LITIGATING ANTITRUST CASES AND COMPLEX CIVIL ACTIONS

A. Cohen, Milstein, Hausfeld, & Toll

Cohen Milstein has more than thirty five years of experience litigating some of the nation's most complicated antitrust cases and recovering billions of dollars in overpayments made by its clients to monopolists, price-fixers, and other violators of the antitrust laws. *See* Cohen Milstein Biography, Ex. D. In 2002 and 2003, the National Law Journal named Cohen Milstein one of the top 25 plaintiffs' firms in the nation.

The firm has more than 50 attorneys, with offices in Washington, D.C., New York, Philadelphia and Chicago. A substantial portion of its practice --indeed, its largest practice group -- is devoted to antitrust class actions, many of which implicate industries that employ complicated technology such as the computer, pharmaceutical, and chemical industries. Cohen Milstein has served as lead counsel on many important antitrust cases, including the following cases:

In re Vitamins Antitrust Litigation, MDL No. 1285 (D.D.C.).

Cohen Milstein served as co-lead counsel for two certified classes of direct purchasers. Chief Judge Hogan approved four major settlements between certain defendants and Class Plaintiffs, including a landmark partial settlement of \$1.1 billion. In a later trial before Chief Judge Hogan concerning four Class Plaintiffs' remaining unsettled claims, a federal jury in Washington unanimously found the defendants liable for participating in the conspiracy and ordered them to pay \$49,539,234, which is trebled to \$148,617,702 under the federal antitrust laws. The case was subsequently settled against those defendants. The National Journal ranked this jury verdict the 12th highest for 2003.

Oncology & Radiation Associates, P.A. v. Bristol Myers Squibb Co., et al., Case No. 1:01CV02313 (D.D.C.). Cohen Milstein was lead counsel; the case settled for \$65,815,000 on behalf of direct purchasers.

North Shore Hematology-Oncology Associates, P.C. v. Bristol-Meyers Squibb Co., Case No. 1:04CV00248 (D.D.C.). Cohen Milstein, which served as lead counsel, investigated and prosecuted this case, leading to a settlement of \$50 million in November 2004.

In re Relafen® Antitrust Litigation, No. 01-12239-WGY (D. Mass.). Cohen Milstein served as co-lead counsel on behalf of a class of direct purchasers and obtained a \$175 million settlement of this action.

Kruman v. Christie's International plc., et al., Docket No. 01-7309. Cohen Milstein served as one of three leading counsel on behalf of foreign plaintiffs and obtained a \$40 million settlement on their behalf. This case marked the first time that claims on behalf of foreign plaintiffs under U.S. antitrust laws have resolved in a U.S. court, a milestone in U.S. antitrust jurisprudence.

In re Domestic Air Transportation Antitrust Litigation (N.D. Ga.) As co-lead counsel, Cohen Milstein obtained a settlement of travel discounts and cash totaling \$458 million for the class of individuals and businesses.

In addition, Michael Hausfeld is regarded as one of the country's top civil litigators. He was recently recognized as one of the "Top 100 Influential Lawyers in America," by the National Journal. *See id.* Chief Judge Edward Korman of the Eastern District of New York, has stated that Mr. Hausfeld is one of the two "leading class action lawyers in the United States." Furthermore, the New York Times has referred to Mr. Hausfeld as one of the "most prominent antitrust lawyers" in the nation. *Id.*

He has served as co-lead counsel on numerous antitrust cases involving a diversity of industries, including genetically engineered foods, managed healthcare companies, technology industries, and auto racing, and involving hosts of international industrial cartels in varied and diverse industries. In 2003, Mr. Hausfeld was the only private attorney permitted to attend the European Commission's closed hearings regarding Microsoft's conduct; while at those hearings, Mr. Hausfeld represented the interests of consumers worldwide. *See id.*

Daniel Small is co-chair of the antitrust practice group at Cohen Milstein. He has been selected as lead counsel in several cases involving varied industries. For example, he was appointed lead counsel in *Paper Systems, Inc. et al. v. Mitsubishi Corp. et al.*,

which settled for more than single damages and co-lead counsel for end-user plaintiffs in *In re Buspirone Antitrust Litigation*, a case involving claims of unlawful monopolization, which settled for \$90 million. Mr. Small, as co-lead counsel tried *Nate Pease, et al. v. Jasper Wyman & Son, Inc., et al.*, Civil Action No. 00-015 (Knox County Superior Court, Me.), to a verdict in favor of a class of blueberry farmers suing processors for price fixing. Mr. Small also has briefed and argued significant appellate cases, including *Free v. Abbott Laboratories*, No. 99-391 in the United States Supreme Court.

B. The Furth Firm

Since its inception in 1966, the Furth Firm has represented clients in a wide variety of antitrust matters at the trial and appellate level in state and federal jurisdictions throughout the country. See <http://www.furth.com>; Furth Firm Biography, Ex. E. In 1967, shortly after its founding, the firm's name partner, Frederick P. Furth, initiated an antitrust class action against gypsum wallboard manufacturers alleging a price-fixing conspiracy. That case, which expanded to include 5,500 plaintiffs in over 140 cases, several hundred lawyers and seven defendants and resulted in \$82 million in damages, established the firm's prominence in the antitrust field.

Since then, the firm, including Michael Lehmann and Thomas Dove, who are eminently qualified, have been appointed lead counsel for plaintiffs in a number of large, nationwide antitrust cases, involving various industries. The Furth Firm LLP has received commendations for its talent at litigating complex civil cases. For example, in one massive nationwide price-fixing case, Judge Carl A. Muecke remarked that "members of Mr. Furth's firm were involved in virtually every aspect of plaintiff's discovery efforts.... In all of these activities, the highest caliber of legal skill was evidenced." *In re Cement & Concrete Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 296, 1980 WL 1994, at *30 (D. Ariz. 1980).

The firm has been lead counsel or class counsel in numerous antitrust cases, including the following actions:

In re Publication Paper Antitrust Litigation (U.S. District Court, District of Connecticut) (Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation No. 1631)

The Furth Firm LLP was appointed co-chair of the Plaintiffs' Executive Committee that runs this case.

In re: High Pressure Laminates Antitrust Litigation (U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York) (Master File No. 00-MD-1368 CLB) (Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation No. 1368)

The Furth Firm LLP was appointed co-lead counsel for the certified class of direct purchasers; two defendants have settled for a total amount exceeding \$40 million.

In re Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litigation (U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, No. C 02-1486 PJH) (Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation No. 1486)

The Furth Firm LLP was appointed to serve on the Executive Committee representing the proposed indirect purchaser class in these proceedings.

In re Tableware Antitrust Litigation And All Related Cases (U.S. District Court, Northern District of California, No.c-04-3514 VRW)

The Furth Firm LLP is one of the lead counsel representing the putative nationwide class.

In re: Microcrystalline Cellulose Antitrust Litigation (U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania) (Master File No. 01-CV-111) (Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation No. 1402)

The Furth Firm LLP is counsel for one part of the certified class in this action; one of the two defendants settled with all plaintiffs for the sum of \$25 million.

In re: Auction Houses Antitrust Litigation (U.S. District Court, Southern District of New York) (Master File No. 00 Civ. 0648 LAK)

The Furth Firm LLP was appointed interim co-lead counsel for the plaintiffs in this nationwide class action, which settled for \$412 million in cash and an additional \$100 million in auction certificates.

In re Brand Name Prescription Drug Antitrust Litigation (U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois)(Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation No. 997)

The Furth Firm LLP was appointed to serve on the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee in these cases, which settled for \$700 million in cash and \$25 million in product

C. Hagens Berman Sobol & Shapiro

For more than a decade, Hagens Berman and its name partners, Steven Berman and Anthony Shapiro have served as court-appointed lead class counsel in complex federal and state actions pending throughout the country. Their efforts have resulted in total recoveries of more than \$260 billion. *See Hagens Berman Firm Biography, Ex. F.* The firm also has a substantial track record in representing plaintiffs in complex civil litigation. For example, Hagens Berman successfully represented 13 states against the tobacco industry, with the end result being the largest settlement in litigation history (\$206 billion).

The firm has more than 35 attorneys with offices in Boston, Chicago, Phoenix, Los Angeles, New York and Seattle. A substantial portion of its practice is devoted to antitrust actions, many of which implicate industries that employ complicated technologies such as the computer and pharmaceutical industries. The firm's expertise was recognized by Microsoft which has engaged the firm to represent it in antitrust class actions as well as other class actions. Recently, Hagens Berman served as lead counsel in the largest antitrust settlement in United States history, reaching a settlement in a case against Visa and Master Card for approximately \$3 billion; the trial judge valued injunctive relief in excess of \$20 billion.

Hagens Berman also has handled antitrust litigation in several important areas, including artificial shortages and price-fixing in the electricity market and price manipulation in the California gas market. Recently, it served as lead counsel in the largest antitrust settlement in United States history, reaching a settlement in a case against

Visa and MasterCard for approximately \$3 billion; the trial judge valued injunctive relief in excess of \$20 billion.

Mr. Berman is the firm's managing partner. He has prosecuted numerous high profile cases implicating complicated facts and technology, including the Washington Public Power Supply System, Exxon Valdez Oil Spill, Michael Milken Litigation, Enron ERISA Litigation, Tobacco Litigation, and the Visa/MasterCard Litigation, and served as special attorney general to 13 states in their tobacco cases (which also had antitrust claims). .

Mr. Berman also has received numerous commendations for his innovative approaches to litigation. In April 2000, the *National Law Journal* listed Mr. Berman as the top litigator in the state and, in June, named him as one of the 100 most powerful lawyers in the nation. In January 2001, *Seattle Magazine* featured him in an issue profiling the top lawyers in Seattle.

Mr. Shapiro has significant complex litigation experience, with a practice that concentrates on antitrust matters, environmental and general commercial disputes, and personal injury cases. In the antitrust arena, he has served as plaintiffs' counsel in the Brand Name Prescription Drug Antitrust Litigation, Carbon Dioxide Antitrust Litigation, Carpet Antitrust Litigation, Infant Formula Antitrust Litigation, Baby Food Antitrust Litigation, Scouring Pads Antitrust Litigation, Medical X-Ray Film Antitrust Litigation, High Fructose Corn Syrup Antitrust Litigation, Visa/MasterCard Antitrust Litigation, Commercial Tissue Products Antitrust Litigation, Flat Glass Antitrust Litigation, Lease Oil Antitrust Litigation, and Bromine Antitrust Litigation. In addition, Mr. Shapiro's work prosecuting plaintiffs' claims against the Alaska Pipeline Service Company

resulting from the 1989 Exxon Valdez Oil Spill ultimately resulted in a \$98 million settlement for plaintiffs.

D. Saveri & Saveri

“For more than forty-five years the firm has specialized in complex, multi-district and class action litigation.” Saveri & Saveri, Inc. Firm Biography, Ex. G. The firm was founded in 1959 by Guido Saveri. Since then, it has litigated numerous antitrust class actions and recovered many millions of dollars on behalf of its clients. Saveri & Saveri, Inc. has served as lead counsel on cases around the country in a variety of jurisdictions, and it has been involved in more than 100 antitrust cases, including the following matters:

Nisley v. Union Carbide and Carbon Corp., 300 F. 2d 561 (10th Cir. 1960), and Continental Ore. Co. v. Union Carbide and Carbon Corp., 370 U.S. 690 (1962). In 1960, Mr. Saveri tried these cases, which helped give rise to Rule 23 and which continue to serve as model class action cases.

In Re Sugar Antitrust Litigation, MDL 201, Mr. Saveri served as lead counsel in this case which settled for more than \$35 million.

In Re Fine Paper Antitrust Litigation, MDL 325, Eastern District of Pennsylvania. Mr. Saveri was a member of the Executive Committee and the trial team. The case was settled for approximately \$80 million.

In Re Ocean Shipping Antitrust Litigation, MDL 395, Southern District of New York. Mr. Saveri held a leadership position among plaintiffs’ counsel; this case was the first class action settlement involving claims by foreign companies. The case was settled for approximately \$79 million.

In Re Coconut Oil Antitrust Litigation, MDL 474, Northern District of California. Mr. Saveri was co-lead counsel.

In Re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litigation, MDL 997, CPK, United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division. Mr. Saveri was Co-Lead Counsel on behalf of approximately 50,000 retail pharmacies nationwide alleging an illegal cartel between 17 drug manufacturers and 6 drug wholesalers in preventing discounts to retail pharmacies. The case was tried for eight weeks. The case settled for \$700 million in cash and \$25 million in product. Mr. Saveri was one of four lead trial lawyers.

In re Citric Acid Antitrust Litigation, MDL 1092, United States District Court, Northern District of California. Mr. Saveri served as Co-Lead counsel representing a certified class of purchasers of citric acid throughout the United States against the citric acid manufacturers for violations of the Sherman Act for fixing the price of citric acid in the United States and around the world. The case settled for \$86 million.

In Re Methionine Antitrust Litigation, MDL 1311, United States District Court, Northern District of California. A nationwide class action on behalf of direct purchasers of methionine alleging price-fixing. Mr. Saveri served as Co-lead counsel on behalf of a certified class that settled for \$107 million.

In Re Dynamic Random Access Memory Antitrust Litigation, MDL 1486 (Judge Hamilton) United States District Court, Northern District of California. Mr. Saveri serves as Co-Lead Counsel on behalf of direct purchasers of dynamic random access memory (DRAM) alleging a nationwide class for price-fixing.

Guido Saveri has long been one of the leaders of the plaintiffs' antitrust bar. Since 1959, he has devoted his entire practice to antitrust litigation, as well as to other corporate and complex litigation. As described in some detail above, Mr. Saveri has actively participated in antitrust cases involving the electrical industry, the water meter industry, scrap metal industry, liquid asphalt industry, dairy products industry, typewriter industry, vanadium industry, pipe-fitting industry, grocery business, liquor industry, movie industry, animal-raising business, chemical industry, snack food industry, paper label industry, chrysanthemum industry, sugar industry, recording industry, industrial gas industry, wheelchair industry, rope industry, copper tubing industry, folding cartons industry, ocean shipping industry, pancreas gland industry, corrugated container industry, glass container industry, fine paper industry, food additives industry, prescription drugs industry, medical x-ray film industry, computer chip industry and many others.

In addition, he has testified before the Federal Judiciary Committee on antitrust matters and has lectured on antitrust matters before the Association of Trial Lawyers of

America, the Federal Practice Institute, and other lawyer associations. Mr. Saveri has also written various periodicals on antitrust topics, and he participated in drafting proposed legislation creating the Panel on Multi-District Litigation.

R. Alexander Saveri also has substantial antitrust experience. He has litigated numerous antitrust and complex civil cases, including some of the following cases on which he is serving as court appointed Co-Lead or Liaison Counsel:

In Re Polychloroprene Antitrust Cases, J.C.C.P. No. 4376, Los Angeles Superior Court (antitrust class action on behalf of all California indirect purchasers of polychloroprene rubber);

In Re NBR Cases, J.C.C.P. No. 4369, San Francisco Superior Court (antitrust class action on behalf of all California indirect purchasers of NBR)

In Re Label Stock Cases, J.C.C.P. No. 4314, San Francisco Superior Court (antitrust class action on behalf of all California indirect purchasers of high pressure label stock)

Smokeless Tobacco Cases I-IV, J.C.C.P. Nos. 4250, 4258, 4259 and 4262, San Francisco Superior Court (certified antitrust class action on behalf of California consumers of smokeless tobacco products);

Compact Disk Cases, J.C.C.P. No. 4123, Los Angeles Superior Court (antitrust class action on behalf of California consumers of prerecorded compact disks);

In re Flat Glass Cases, J.C.C.P. No. 4033, San Francisco Superior Court (antitrust class action on behalf of California indirect purchasers of flat glass products);

Vitamin Cases, J.C.C.P. No. 4076, San Francisco Superior Court (antitrust class action on behalf of California indirect purchasers of vitamins);

E. Prickett, Jones & Elliott (Proposed Liaison Counsel)

Since 1888, Prickett Jones has had a significant presence among the Delaware legal establishment. *See* Prickett, Jones & Elliott Biography, Ex.H. Its attorneys regularly appear before judges in the United States District Court for the District of Delaware, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, as well as all Delaware state courts including the Delaware Supreme Court.

James Holzman practices in all areas involving Delaware corporation law and business litigation. Mr. Holzman is listed in the Best Lawyers in America and has served as Chair of the Business and Corporate Litigation Committee of the American Bar Association Section of Business Law.

Clearly, all of these attorneys and firms have the experience to undertake this litigation, and they are willing and able to harvest the necessary resources to litigate these actions zealously and effectively.

III. ENTERING THE PROPOSED ORDER WILL BEST REPRESENT THE INTERESTS OF THE PROPOSED CLASS AND ALSO EXPEDITE THE LITIGATION

In appointing lead counsel, courts additionally consider whether the proposed lead counsel will “act fairly, efficiently, and economically in the interest of all parties and parties’ counsel.” *In re Cardinal Health, Inc.*, 225 F.R.D. at 555. *See also In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.*, 292 F.Supp.2d at 653-56; *In re Auction Houses Antitrust Litig.*, 197 F.R.D. 71, 75 (S.D.N.Y. 2000). Indeed, “[t]he Court has power to act prior to addressing the merits of the class certification motion; it may appoint counsel to represent the proposed class. . . . Prompt designation of capable counsel *now* who are able to proceed forcefully and promptly to help protect the prospective class, with the possibility of additional counsel from the plaintiffs’ bar to be appointed subsequently to serve as a committee, will *expedite* this litigation and help ensure protection of the putative class.” *In re Joint Eastern and Southern Districts Asbestos Litig.*, 132 F.R.D. 332, 333-34 (E.D.N.Y.; S.D.N.Y., 1990) (emphasis added) (citations omitted).

Here, the proposed lead firms have a long history of working together in the joint prosecution of antitrust actions in a fair and efficient manner. Accordingly, these attorneys and firms enjoy overwhelming support. As indicated by the extensive list of

cases in Exhibits B hereto, all but a handful of plaintiffs in the Centralized Actions support this co-lead structure. Thus, because there already is substantial consensus among counsel, entering the proposed order would best reflect the interests of the plaintiffs in the Centralized Actions.

Entering the proposed order also will expedite the litigation. The proposed lead counsel structure is not only established and well organized, it is also comprised of firms that have offices on the East Coast – where this Court and many parties are located and also on the West Coast – where AMD and Intel are headquartered and many important documents and witnesses in these actions reside. The bi-coastal nature of this proposed lead counsel organization will enhance the efficiency of the litigation and also conserve resources. Moreover, these attorneys already have taken steps to coordinate the production of initial disclosures and other discovery with AMD's and Intel's attorneys. They have demonstrated their intention and ability to coordinate and expedite discovery, and thereby advance the interests of all federal purchaser plaintiffs.

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, certain plaintiffs from the Centralized Actions respectfully request that the Court enter the attached proposed order seeking consolidation of all federal purchaser actions for pretrial proceedings, consistent with the JPML Order, attached as Exhibit A and further seeking appointment of the proposed co-lead counsel structure.

November 10, 2005

Michael D. Hausfeld
Daniel A. Small
Brent W. Landau
Allyson B. Baker
COHEN, MILSTEIN, HAUSFELD &
TOLL, P.L.L.C.
1100 New York Avenue, NW
Suite 500, West Tower
Washington, DC 20005
Proposed Co-Lead Counsel

Michael P. Lehmann
Thomas P. Dove
Alex C. Turan
THE FURTH FIRM, LLP
225 Bush Street, 15th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Proposed Co-Lead Counsel

Steven W. Berman
Anthony Shapiro
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO,
LLP
1301 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2900
Seattle, WA 98101
Proposed Co-Lead Counsel

Guido Saveri
R. Alexander Saveri
SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.
111 Pine Street, Suite 1700
San Francisco, CA 94111
Proposed Co-Lead Counsel

PRICKETT, JONES & ELLIOTT, P.A.

/S/ Eric M. Andersen

James L. Holzman (DE Bar # 663)
David W. Gregory (DE Bar #4408)
Eric M. Andersen (DE Bar #4376)
1310 King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 888-6500
jlholzman@prickett.com
dwgregory@prickett.com
Proposed Liaison Counsel

D. Natalie Finkelman
Bennett Shepard
Finkelman, Miller & Shah, LLC
35 East State Street
Media, PA 19603
Telephone: (610) 891-9880
Counsel for Ludy A. Chacon

James E. Miller
Bennett Shepard
Finkelman, Miller & Shah, LLC
65 Main Street
Chester, CT 06412-1311
Telephone: (860) 526-1100
Counsel for Ludy A. Chacon

Ira Neil Richards
R. Andrew Santillo
Trujillo Rodriguez & Richards, LLC
226 W. Rittenhouse Square,
The Penthouse
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 731-9004
Counsel for Ludy A. Chacon

Jeffrey S. Goddess
Rosenthal, Monhait, Gross & Goddess, P.A.
919 Market Street, Suite 1401
P.O. Box 1070
Wilmington, DE 19899-1070
Telephone: (302) 656-4433
Counsel for Ludy A. Chacon, Joseph Samuel Cone, Michael K. Simon

Douglas P. Dehler
The Dehler Law Firm, S.C.
250 N. Sunnyslope Road, Suite 300
Brookfield, WI 53005
Telephone: (262) 780-7041
Counsel for Ludy A. Chacon

Marc A. Wites
Wites & Kapetan, P.A.
4400 North Federal Highway
Lighthouse Point, FL 33064
Telephone: (954) 570-8989
Counsel for Ludy A. Chacon

John R. Minnino
J. Minnino, LLC
475 White Horse Pike
Collingswood, NJ 08107-2909
Telephone: (856) 833-0600
Counsel for Ludy A. Chacon

Anthony J. Bolognese
Joshua Grabar
Bolognese & Associates, LLC
One Penn Center Plaza
1617 JFK Boulevard, Suite 650
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 814-6750
Counsel for Phil Paul

Douglas G. Thompson, Jr.
William P. Butterfield
Finkelstein, Thompson & Loughran
1050 30th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20007
Telephone: (202) 337-8000
*Counsel for Plaintiffs Carol Cowan,
Leonard Lorenzo and Russell Dennis,
Damon DiMarco, Ian Walker*

Daniel Hume
David Kovel
Kirby McInerney & Squire, LLP
830 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 371-6600
Counsel for Matthew Kravitz and Raphael Allison

Michele C. Jackson
Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP
Embarcadero Center West
275 Battery Street, 30th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3399
Telephone: (415) 956-1000
Counsel for Huston Frazier, Jeanne Cook Frazier and Brian Weiner

Steven O. Sidener
Joseph M. Barton
Gold Bennett Cera & Sidener, LLP
595 Market Street, Suite 2300

San Francisco, CA 94106
Telephone: (415) 777-2230
Counsel for Jerome Feitelberg

Robert S. Kitchenoff
Steven A. Asher
Mindee Reuben
Weinstein Kitchenoff & Asher, LLC
1845 Walnut Street, Suite 1100
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 545-7200
Joseph Samuel Cone

Francis O. Scarpulla
Law Offices of Francis R. Scarpulla
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 788-7210
Counsel for Michael Brauch, Andrew Meimes, Lazio Family Products

Craig C. Corbitt
Zelle Hofmann Voelbel Mason & Gette, LLP
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 693-0700
Counsel for Michael Brauch, Andrew Meimes, Lazio Family Products, Law offices of Laurel Stanley

Scott E. Chambers
Jeffrey J. Clark
Schmittinger and Rodriguez, P.A.
414 South State Street
P.O. Box 497
Dover, DE 19903
*Counsel for Lena K. Manyin;
Jason Craig*

Jeffrey F. Keller
Kathleen R. Scanlan
Law Offices of Jeffrey F. Keller
425 Second Street, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94107
Telephone: (415) 543-1305

Counsel for Susan Baxley, David E. Lipton, Dana F. Thibedeau, Ronald Konieczka, Maria I. Prohias, Steven J. Hamilton, Patricia M. Niehaus, Kevin Stoltz, Peter Jon Naigow

Mark Reinhardt
Garrett D. Blanchfield, Jr.
Reinhardt Wendorf & Blanchfield
332 Minnesota Street, Suite E-1250
St. Paul, MN 55101
Telephone: (651) 287-2100
Counsel for Susan Baxley

Joseph Patane
Law Office of Joseph M. Patane
2280 Union Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
Telephone: (415) 346-0679
Counsel for Lawrence Lang, Karol Juskiewicz

Mario Nunzio Alioto
Trump Alioto Trump & Prescott, LLP
2280 Union Street
San Francisco, CA 94123
Telephone: (415) 346-0679
Counsel for Lawrence Lang, Karol Juskiewicz

Spencer Hosie
Bruce J. Wecker
Hosie McArthur LLP
One Market Street
Spear Street Tower #2200
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: (415) 247-6000
Counsel for Dwight E. Dickerson

Steven Greenfogel
Daniel B. Allanoff
Meredith Cohen Greenfogel & Skirnick, P.C.
22nd Floor, Architects Building
117 S. 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 564-5182
Counsel for Benjamin Allanoff

Robert N. Kaplan
Richard J. Kilsheimer

Gregory K. Arenson
Kaplan, Fox & Kilsheimer LLP
805 Third Avenue, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 687-1980
Counsel for Christian Ambruoso

Eugene A. Spector
Jeffrey L. Kodroff
Jeffrey J. Corrigan
William G. Caldes
Spector, Roseman & Kodroff, P.C.
1818 Market Street, Suite 2500
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 496-0300
*Counsel for Lena Manyin,
Jason Craig, Andrew S. Cohn,
Maria Griffin, Paul Ramos,
David Arnold*

Steven A. Kanner
Douglas A. Millen
William H. London
Much Shelist Freed Denenberg Ament & Rubenstein, P.C.
191 North Wacker Drive
Suite 1800
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 521-2000
Counsel for HP Consulting Services, Inc., Phillip Boeding

Kenneth A. Wexler
Edward A. Wallace
The Wexler Firm LLP
One N. LaSalle Street, Suite 2000
Chicago, IL 60602
Telephone: (312) 346-2222
Counsel for Peter Jon Naigow

Allan Steyer
Steyer Lowenthal Boodrookas Alvarez & Smith, LLP
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 421-3400
*Counsel for Jodi Salpeter, Jay Salpeter,
Cheryl Glick-Salpeter, Michael H. Roach*

James R. Malone, Jr.
Chimicles & Tikellis LLP
361 West Lancaster Avenue
Haverford, PA 19041
Telephone: 610-642-8500
*Counsel for Elizabeth Bruderle Baran, Paul C. Czysz, Carrol Cowan, Leonard Lorenzo,
Russell Dennis, Angel Genese, Gideon Elliott, Nir Goldman, Damon DiMarco,*

Robert C. Shubert
Juden Justice Reed
Peter E. Borkon
Shubert & Reed LLP
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 788-4220
Counsel for Patrick J. Hewson

Dan E. Gustafson
Jason S. Kilene
Gustafson Gluek PLLC
725 Northstar East
608 Second Avenue S.
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 333-8844
Counsel for Fairmont Orthopedics & Sports Medicine

Chad C. Noland
Chad C. Noland, P.C.
109 North 4th Street
Suite 300
Bismarck, ND 58502-0640
Telephone: (701) 222-3030
Counsel for Melinda Harr, D.D.S., P.C.

Mark A. Griffin
Keller Rohrback L.L.P.
1201 Third Avenue
Suite 3200
Seattle, WA 98101-3052
Telephone: (206) 623-1900
Counsel for Henry Korngay

Samuel D. Heins
Vincent J. Esades

Troy J. Hutchinson
Heins Mills & Olson, P.L.C.
3550 I.D.S. Center
80 S. Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 338-4605
Counsel for Bergenson & Associates, Inc.

Gerald Rodos
Mark R. Rosen
Jeffrey B. Gittelman
Barrack Rodos & Bacine
3300 Two Commerce Square
2001 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 963-0600
Counsel for Michael K. Simon

Hollis L. Salzman
Kellie Safar
Goodkind Labaton Rudoff & Sucharow LLP
100 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10017-5563
Telephone: (212) 907-0700
Counsel for Angel Genese, Gideon Elliott, Nir Goldman

Roberta D. Liebenberg
Donald L. Perelman
Fine Kaplan and Black, RPC
1835 Market Street, 28th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6565
Counsel for Kevin Stoltz

Joseph W. Cotchett
Bruce L. Simon
Nancy Fineman
Kelly L. Bulawsky
Cotchett, Pitre, Simon & McCarthy
840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200
Burlingame, CA 94010
Telephone: (650) 697-6000
Counsel for Trotter-Vogel Realty, Inc. dba Prudential California Realty

Jeffrey S. Goldenberg

John C. Murdock
Murdock, Goldenberg Schneider & Groh, L.P.A.
700 Walnut Street, Suite 400
Cincinnati, OH 45202-2011
Counsel for Ronald Konieczka, Patricia M. Niehaus

Lance A. Harke
Howard M. Bushman
Harke & Clasby LLP
155 South Miami Avenue, Suite 600
Miami, FL 33130
Counsel for Maria I. Prohias

Randy R. Renick
Law Offices of Randy Renick
128 North Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 204
Pasadena, CA 91103
Telephone: (626) 585-9600
Counsel for the Harmon Press

Gordon Ball
Ball & Scott
Bank of America Building
550 West Main Avenue, Suite 750
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902
Telephone: (865) 525-7028-

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Eric M. Andersen, hereby certify that on this 10th day of November, 2005, the foregoing Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Consolidation and for Appointment of Co-Lead Plaintiff and Liaison Counsel was served on counsel for the following parties as indicated below:

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Joel Freidlander
James G. McMillan, III
Bouchard, Margules & Friedlander, PA
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 1400
Wilmington, DE 19801

Jeffrey S. Goddess
Rosenthal, Monhait, Gross & Goddess
Mellon Bank Center, Suite 1401
P.O. Box 1070
Wilmington, DE 19899-1070

Scott E. Chambers
Jeffrey J. Clark
Schmittinger & Rodriguez, PA
414 State Street
P.O. Box 497
Dover, DE 19903

Robert D. Goldberg
Biggs and Battaglia
921 North Orange Street
P.O. Box 1489
Wilmington, DE 19899-1489

Pamela S. Tikellis
Robert J. Kriner, Jr.
A. Zachary Naylor
Robert R. Davis
Chimicles & Tikellis LLP
One Rodney Square
P.O. Box 1035
Wilmington, DE 19999

Richard L. Horwitz
David E. Moore
Potter Anderson & Corroon LLP
Hercules Plaza
1313 North Market Street
Wilmington, Delaware 19801

R. Bruce McNew
Taylor & McNew, LLP
3711 Kennett Pike, Suite 210
Greenville, DE 19807

VIA FIRST CLASS U.S. MAIL

Francis O. Scarpulla
Law Offices of Francis O. Scarpulla
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94104

Joseph M. Patane
Law Offices of Joseph M. Patane
2280 Union Street
San Francisco, CA 94123

Spencer Hosie
Bruce J. Wecker
Hosie McArthur LLP
One Market, Spear Street Tower, #2200
San Francisco, CA 94105

Kenneth A. Wexler
Edward A. Wallace
The Wexler Firm LLP
One LaSalle Street, Suite 2000
Chicago, IL 60602

Randy R. Renick
Law Offices of Randy R. Renick
128 North Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 204
Pasadena, CA 91103

Howard M. Bushman
Harke & Clasby LLP
155 South Miami Avenue, Suite 600
Miami, FL 33130

Steven Greenfogel
Meredith Cohen Greenfogel &
Skirnick, P.C.
22nd Floor, Architects Building
117 S. 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Jeffrey F. Keller
Kathleen R. Scanlan
Law Office of Jeffrey F. Keller
425 Second Street, Suite 500
San Francisco, CA 94107

Robert C. Schubert
Juden Justice Reed
Peter E. Borkon
Schubert & Reed LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1650
San Francisco, CA 94111

Michael L. Kirby
Post Kirby Noonan and Sweat
600 West Broadway
Suite 1100
San Diego, CA 92101-3302

Daniel J. Mogin
The Mogin Law Firm, P.C.
110 Juniper Street
San Diego, CA 92101-1502

Gordon Ball
Ball & Scott
550 W. Main Avenue, Suite 750
Knoxville, TN 37902

Daniel Karon
55 Public Square, Suite 1500
Cleveland, OH 44113

Amamgbo & Associates
1940 Embarcadero
Oakland, California 94606

Mayo & Rogers
Attn: Terence Mayo
114 Sansome Street, Suite 1310
San Francisco, CA 94104

Alexander, Hawes & Audet
152 N. Third Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95112

Law Offices of Krishna B. Narine
7839 Montgomery Avenue, Third Floor
Elkins Park, Pennsylvania 19027

Isaac L. Diel
Law Office of Isaac L. Diel
135 Oak Street
Bonner Springs, KS 66012

Edward M. Gergosian
Robert J. Gralewski, Jr.
Gergosian & Gralewski LLP
550 West C Street, Suite 1600
San Diego, CA 92101

Thomas M. Ferlauto
King & Ferlauto, LLP
1880 Century Park East, Suite 820
Los Angeles, CA 90067

/s/ Eric M. Andersen
Eric M. Andersen (#4376)